



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,205	06/08/2006	Dieter Ramsauer	STR-1012/500638.20034	4002
26418	7590	12/08/2009		
REED SMITH, LLP				EXAMINER
ATTN: PATENT RECORDS DEPARTMENT				MERLINO, ALYSON MARIE
599 LEXINGTON AVENUE, 29TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10022-7650				3673
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/08/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/582,205	RAMSAUER ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> ALYSON M. MERLINO	<b>Art Unit</b> 3673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 20-40 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 20-40 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 January 2009 and 13 August 2009 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The examiner acknowledges applicant's amendments to claims 20-40 and the cancellation of claims 1-19 filed 13 August 2009.

##### ***Response to Amendment***

2. The amendment filed 13 August 2009 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: Figures 7, 8A, 8B, and 9, and new Paragraphs 47.1 and 47.2. There is no support in the original disclosure for these amendments. Specifically, there is no support in the original disclosure for one of the toothed wheels being substituted for another. This relationship was brought from the examiner's discussion of the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112. This relationship was the only relationship to be surmised from the drawings, without any other discussion of the relationship between the tooth wheels within the specification, since the specification does not clearly set forth the relationship whether it be that the wheels are interchangeable or separate components utilized in separate portions of the device. The specification discusses the wheels as separate elements, and does not provide support for the interchangeable relationship added to the specification in new Paragraph 47.2. In regards to Figure 9, there is also no support for this figure in the original disclosure, and it is unclear to which aspect of the device applicant intends to illustrate in Figure 9.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. **Claims 20-40 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. It is unclear how the device operates in light of the newly added Figures 7, 8A, and 8B, in view of the specification. Figure 7 shows the drive toothed wheel 18 connected to the lever 16, however, Figure 3 shows the driven toothed wheel 26 connected to the lever. It is unclear whether the drive toothed wheel 18 is connected to and rotated by the lever 16, with the drive toothed wheel engaging the lock rod 20, so that when the drive toothed wheel is rotated, the lock rod rotates a driven toothed wheel 26 that is connected to a lock element, or that the drive toothed wheel 18 and the driven toothed wheel, since they have the same structure, are interchangeable in their positions with respect to the lever and the lock element. Furthermore, the specification discusses multiple drive toothed wheels (Paragraph 36), and it is unclear how the device incorporates multiple drive toothed wheels if the claims recite one drive toothed wheel connected to the actuation member. For examination purposes, the claims will be given a broad interpretation until further clarification from applicant.

5. **In regards to claim 28**, it is unclear from the specification to which closing forces applicant is referring since the specification only states that the high closing forces must be overcome, not that closing forces are applied to the shaped part. For examination purposes, the claim will be given a broad interpretation until further clarification from applicant.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. **Claims 20-23, 25-32, 39, and 40 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fisher (US-959494).

8. **In regards to claim 20**, Fisher discloses a fastener for multiple locking of doors or wall portions in housings or cabinets including a lockable actuation member 19, such as a lever (Figure 1), a drive toothed wheel 4a, 15a which is connected to the actuation member (Figures 2 and 3) supported in a door so as to be rigid against rotation with respect to the actuation member (apparent that drive toothed wheel is rigidly connected to the actuation member by stem 4a, Figures 2 and 3) and engages with a lock rod 18 which is supported in the door so as to be axially displaceable (apparent from Figure 1) with teeth (portioned engages gear 15a, Figure 2) on at least one side, and at least one lock element 6 which is held in the door so as to be rotatable or swivelable (apparent from Figure 4) and which is coupled with the lock rod (Figure 1). Fisher further

discloses that for each lock element, a driven toothed wheel 4, 15 is directly connected to the lock element against rotation with respect to the lock element (apparent from Figure 5) and engages with the toothing of the lock rod (Figures 1 and 5). Fisher also discloses that the driven toothed wheel is held on the door in a rotatable manner in order to couple the lock rod with the at least one lock element (Figures 1 and 5).

9. **In regards to claim 21**, Fisher discloses that the lock rod is supported so as to be axially displaceable in a plurality of separate metal guide parts 17.

10. **In regards to claim 22**, Fisher discloses that the lock rod is supported so as to be axially displaceable, and is guided in an elongated metal profile (profile created by component 17, Figure 2).

11. **In regards to claim 23**, Fisher discloses that the lock rod is guided near the edge of the door (Figure 1).

12. **In regards to claims 25 and 26**, Fisher discloses that the lock element includes a bent and/or shaped sheet metal lug 5 which can be swiveled in behind a housing contour 12 or cabinet frame contour (Figure 4).

13. **In regards to claims 27, 29, and 30**, Fisher discloses that the lock element includes a metal carrier part 3 on which a shaped part 5 made of a material so that the shaped part can slide so as to be swiveled in behind a housing contour 12 or cabinet frame contour (Figure 4).

14. **In regards to claim 28**, Fisher discloses that the shaped part which is arranged on the lock element for engaging behind the housing contour or cabinet frame contour

has a curved contour (contour shown near reference character 5, Figure 5) which enables a long closing path (apparent from Figure 1).

15. **In regards to claims 31 and 40**, Fisher discloses that the metal profile has a "substantially" U-shaped cross section (cross section shown in Figure 3) which encloses the lock rod and toothed wheels (Figure 2).
16. **In regards to claim 32**, Fisher discloses that the U-shaped profile can be closed by a cover (cover created by portion 10, Figure 3).
17. **In regards to claim 39**, Fisher discloses that the lock rod is guided in such a way that it lies between the door frame and the toothed wheel (apparent from Figures 1-3).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
19. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

20. **Claim 24 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher (US-959494) in view of Munich et al. (US-5172944). Fisher discloses the fastener as applied to claim 20 above, with the at least one lock element being arranged on the driven toothed wheel so as to be rigid against rotation with respect to the driven toothed wheel (apparent that the lock element is rigidly connected to the shaft 4 of the driven toothed wheel, Figure 5), but fails to disclose a second lock element that is arranged on the drive toothed wheel so as to be rigid against rotation with respect to the drive toothed wheel. Munich et al. teaches a fastener (Figure 2) having at least one lock element 18 arranged on a driven toothed wheel (toothed portion 50 of component 18, Figure 2) so as to be rigid against rotation with respect to the driven toothed wheel, and a second lock element 22 arranged on a drive toothed wheel (toothed portion 50 of component 22, Figure 2) so as to be rigid against rotation with respect to the drive toothed wheel, with the drive toothed wheel connected to an actuation member 16. Since the inclusion of a second lock element on the drive toothed wheel disclosed by Fisher would not hinder the ability of the drive toothed wheel to engage the lock rod, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a second lock element on the drive toothed wheel (include on portion 4a of drive toothed wheel, Figure 3) in the same manner that the at least one lock element is arranged on the driven toothed wheel, since Munich et al. teaches the use of

a lock element with a toothed wheel that is connected to an actuation member and in order to enhance the security of the device.

21. **Claims 33-36 and 38 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher (US-959494) in view of Segawa (US Pub. No. 2003/0024285 A1).

22. **In regards to claim 33**, Fisher discloses the fastener as applied to claims 20-23, 25-32, 39, and 40 above, but fails to disclose that the actuation member includes a swivel lever that can be folded into a trough arranged on the door. Segawa teaches an actuation member (Figure 5) or handle including a swivel lever 13 that can be folded into a trough 1 arranged on a door 2. Since the replacement of the actuation member or handle disclosed by Fisher with the handle taught by Segawa would not hinder the ability of the toothed wheel engaging the lock bar, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the handle disclosed by Fisher with the handle taught by Segawa since it handle taught by Segawa would rotate in the same manner as the handle disclosed by Fisher and since the handle of Fisher and the handle of Segawa are considered as art recognized equivalents, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the exercise art to substitute one for the other.

23. **In regards to claim 34**, Segawa teaches that the tough includes saw-proofing protection 24 (Figure 7).

24. **In regards to claim 35**, Segawa teaches that the saw-proofing protection can also be retrofitted into an inner contour (portion near reference character 27, Figure 5) of the swivel lever.

25. **In regards to claim 36**, Segawa teaches that the saw-proofing protection is a cylindrical pin (Figure 7), and is supported in the handle lever so as to be rotatable around a cylinder axis (axis through pin, Figure 7) of the cylindrical pin.

26. **In regards to claim 38**, Segawa teaches that the trough has shallow sloping outer side walls (apparent from Figure 1).

27. **Claim 37 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher (US-959494) in view of Segawa (US Pub. No. 2003/0024285 A1) in further view of Jancsek (US-5862690).

28. **In regards to claim 37**, Fisher in view of Segawa discloses the fastener's handle as applied to claims 33-36 and 38 above, but fails to teach that the trough includes a lettering surface for displaying the rotating direction or other writing and/or symbols such as company logos. Jancsek teaches a handle (Figure 1) with a trough 22 that includes a lettering surface 34 for displaying writing and/or symbols such as a company logo 36. Since the inclusion of a letting surface on the trough of the handle taught by Segawa would not hinder the ability of the handle to actuate the fastener, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a lettering surface in order to allow an individual to make the fastener aesthetically pleasing.

***Response to Arguments***

29. Applicant's arguments filed 13 August 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

30. In regards to applicant's remarks concerning the rejections of claims 20-40 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, applicant is referred to the new matter rejection of the amendments to the specification and the drawings set forth above. As discussed above, the amendments to the specification and the drawings are considered new matter and the claim language is still indefinite, therefore, the rejections of claims 20-40 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Furthermore, the rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is maintained since the claim was not amended and applicant did not provide remarks to clarify the claim language.

31. The examiner appreciates applicant's amendments to claims 39, and therefore, the rejection of claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in the previous office action is withdrawn.

32. The examiner appreciates applicant's amendments to the specification and the claims, and therefore, the objections to the specification and the claims set forth in the previous office action are withdrawn. Applicant is referred to the new matter rejections above in regards to the amendments to the specification and new figures.

33. In regards to applicant's remarks in Section II of the remarks, applicant is referred to the clarification within the 102(b) rejection of claims 20-23, 25-32, 39, and 40 based on Fisher set forth above. It is clear that the driven toothed wheel 15 of Fisher has a portion 4 that is directly connected to the lock element, as discussed in the

rejection above. Furthermore, the portion 4 and the driven toothed wheel 15 of Fisher operate as a unit, and applicant's device utilizes shaft 41 and cap screw 50 to connect the driven toothed wheel to the lock element 38. The claim language does not set forth the structure of the driven toothed wheel and the lock element that create a "direct" connection between the two as remarked by applicant, therefore, the rejections are maintained.

***Conclusion***

34. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALYSON M. MERLINO whose telephone number is (571)272-2219. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Cuomo can be reached on (571) 272-6856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Peter M. Cuomo/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3673

AM  
December 5, 2009